



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,982	08/26/2003	Firouzeh Keshmiri	053182-9007-02	6724

23409 7590 04/01/2005

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

KATCHEVES, BASIL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,982

Applicant(s)

KESHMIRI, FIROUZEH

Examiner

Basil Katcheves

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant has amended claim 1 in the paper entered 1/21/05. Pending claim 1-5 are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,758,464 to Hatton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,002,620 to King as in the previous office action.

Regarding claim 1, Hatton discloses a retaining wall having a base made of blocks (fig. 2: see bottom row of blocks), a wall assembly made of blocks and a plurality of spaced apart vertically elongated reinforcing strips (fig. 2: 17) secured to the face by a plurality of fasteners (fig. 2: 19) comprised of nails or screws directly engaged to the wall (column 3: lines 59-65) which extend through the strips into the blocks. However, Hatton does not disclose the blocks as being made of fiber reinforced cellular cementitious material. King discloses the use of a fiber reinforced cellular cementitious material (abstract, line 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Morton by using a fiber concrete, as disclosed by King, in order to increase the strength of the blocks. In addition, Hatton does not disclose the use of fasteners which are commonly used with lumber. However, it would have been obvious to use such fasteners in place of masonry fasteners, as masonry fasteners may be used as a functional equivalent.

Art Unit: 3635

Regarding claim 2, King discloses the fiber concrete as being made from a cementitious material mixed with water, fiber (column 1, lines 64-65) and an aerating material (column 1, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 3, Hatton in view of King discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application but does not disclose specific percentages of the combined materials. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed dimensions, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims.

Regarding claim 4, King discloses the cement as being made of ash and silica (column 1, line 65) but does not disclose specific percentages of the materials. Applicant fails to show criticality for specifically claimed dimensions, therefore it would have been an obvious design choice to use the dimensions such as specified in these claims.

Claim 5 is rejected for reasons cited in the rejections of claims 2 and 4.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/05 are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the additional limitation of fasteners commonly used with lumber will not be met by the prior art. However, applicant should note that the limitation is comprised mostly of functional language. The basic claim structure of the new limitations is examined and is a functional equivalent to the masonry fasteners, as claimed in the instant application.

Art Unit: 3635

Since there is no fastener structure claimed, the masonry fasteners meet the limitations of the application.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (571) 272-6842.

BK


Basil Katcheves

3/22/05

Examiner AU 3635